

Serial No. 09/977,252  
Amdt. dated April 12, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

Docket No. K-0329

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Figures 1 and 2 have been amended to correct minor informalities and to correspond with the description in the specification. Formal drawings will be filed in due course.

Attachment: Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 15-20 have been amended and claims 22-25 have been added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to; the abstract was objected to; claims 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; claims 15, 18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Xu; claims 1-14 were allowed; and claims 16-20 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

In addition, it is respectfully noted an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was filed on January 25, 2002. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner issue an acknowledged PTO Form 1449 in the next Office Action.

Regarding the objections to the drawings, enclosed are marked-up drawings illustrating a forward processor, backward processor, memory and output determination module, which are described in the specification. Further, the Office Action indicates Figure 1 should be labeled "Prior Art." However, it is respectfully noted Figure 1 is already labeled "Related Art." Formal drawings will be filed in due course. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Further, the abstract has been amended as suggested in the Office Action.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be also withdrawn.

Similarly, claims 15-20 have been amended in light of the comments noted in the Office Action regarding the rejection of claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 15, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Xu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 15 is directed to a method of turbo-decoding a received sequence using a Maximum A Posteriori (MAP) algorithm including performing a learning by a backward processor for a predetermined length, calculating and storing first resultant values obtained by the backward processor, calculating second resultant values by a forward processor that overlaps in time with the next learning, and determining a decoding symbol output using the second resultant values and the stored first resultant values of the previous window. Further, if a processing length of the backward processor is  $W$ , and a length of a received bit sequence is  $K$ , a length of a first data block  $W_0$  to be processed is determined by the equation  $K \bmod W$ .

As noted in the specification at paragraphs [87] and [88], for example,  $W_0$  is determined by the equation  $N \bmod W$ , where  $N$  is the length of the received sequence and "mod" (refers to modulo calculation).

Serial No. 09/977,252  
Amdt. dated April 12, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

Docket No. K-0329

It is respectfully noted Xu teaches dividing a trellis into windows and selecting a first window of the trellis in Figure 17, steps 202 and 204. However, Xu does not teach or suggest determining a length of the first block as claimed. Rather, in Xu, it appears each block is fixed in size. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claim 15 and each of the claims depending therefrom are also allowable.

In addition, new claims 22-25 have been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope and Applicants submit the new claims are supported by the originally filed specification. It is respectfully submitted the new claims also patentability define over the applied art.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 09/977,252  
Amdt. dated April 12, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

Docket No. K-0329

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607  
and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Daniel Y.J. Kim".

Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.  
Registration No. 36,186  
David A. Bilodeau, Esq.  
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 DYK/DAB:lew:tlg:lew  
**Date: April 12, 2005**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**